Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. Present were Chair Zach Bergeron, members Vincent Chiozzi (arrived at 7:42 p.m.), Jay Doherty, Joan Duff, Ann Knowles and associate member Steve Pouliot; also present were Paul Materazzo, Director of Planning, Jacki Byerley, Planner and Tom Urbelis, Town Counsel.

50 Frontage Road - Cambridge Isotope Laboratories:

Mr. Bergeron opened the continued public hearing on an application filed by Cambridge Isotope Laboratories for a Special Permit for Major Non-Residential Project for interior renovations and the conversion of an existing interior courtyard to laboratory uses at their existing facility located at 50 Frontage Road.

Ms. Byerley informed the Board that the meeting was left open for revised plans to be submitted based off of comments received at the IDR. She listed the items from the IDR, and stated that the Board of Health, Planning Division and Town Engineer are satisfied with the O&M plan. Mr. Bergeron asked Doug Hartnett, Principle of Highpoint Engineering, representing the applicant if he had anything that he would like to add and he stated that he did not.

On a motion by Ms. Duff seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board moved to close the public hearing for 50 Frontage Road. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

On a motion by Ms. Duff seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board moved to find the Cambridge Isotope Laboratories expansion to the existing building at 50 Frontage Road complies with the requirements and criteria of Sections 9.4 and 9.5 of the Andover Zoning Bylaw and the proposed use will not be unreasonably detrimental to the established or future character of the neighborhood and Town and is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Bylaw. Further the Board conditionally approves the special permit submitted by Cambridge Isotope Laboratories for an expansion of the existing building with associated site work. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

Other Business:

On a motion by Ms. Duff seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board moved to accept the minutes of June 10, 2014. **Vote:** Unanimous (4-0).

<u>254 Lowell Street – Strawberry Hill Farm:</u>

Mr. Bergeron opened the public hearing on an application submitted by National Development Acquisitions, LLC for a Special Permit for Elderly Housing for a development at 254 Lowell Street the former Strawberry Hill Farm.

Mark Johnson, an attorney representing the applicant introduced Ted Tye, Managing Partner of National Development. Mr. Tye informed the Board that this development is a joint venture between National Development, Epoch Senior Living and B'nai B'rith Housing. National Development recently completed similar projects in Westford and Hingham, MA. Mr. Tye gave an overview of why senior housing is needed in Andover and touched on the growing senior population and the lack of affordable housing options. He explained that the concept is a congregate care community, also known as a senior campus.

254 Lowell Street – Strawberry Hill Farm (cont'd):

Mr. Tye explained that the 9.2 acre parcel is the former Strawberry Hill Farm and is located in the SRB zoning district. The current property owners want the land to be developed in a way that will benefit the community. This is an allowed use with a Special Permit from the Planning Board. The applicant has been through the IDR process and a peer review on the drainage is underway. The project will require a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to regrade a slope in the middle of the parcel.

The site will be developed in two phases for a total of two buildings and 133 total units. Phase 1 will be a one floor memory care facility with 63 units known as The Bridges at Andover. Phase 2 will be a three floor facility with 70 one bedroom units known as the Andover Senior Residences. The development is for residents 55 and older with mixed incomes. There will be 137 parking spaces provided on the property and no residents of the Bridges will have cars.

Mr. Tye showed a rendering of the buildings and stated that they will have traditional New England style architecture. He showed on the site layout plan that the sidewalk on Lowell Street will be rebuilt and tied into walking paths around the property. All units in the Andover Senior Residences will be affordable with a local preference being proposed.

Susan Gittelman of B'nai B'rith Housing spoke to the affordability aspect of the Andover Senior Residences. She stated half of Andover's senior households earn less than \$50,000 per year with the project being consistent with the Town's Master Plan goals for housing. The waiting list for elderly housing is currently two years, and the number of seniors in Town will grow by 78% in the next fifteen years while the population will only increase by 7%. This development will also assist residents who would like to bring an aging parent to the community. This type of development has less of an impact than single family homes or multifamily housing. Both buildings will pay taxes to the Town and will create 40 +/ - full and part time jobs. The traffic impact for senior housing is negligible as it is the lowest impact of any use group.

Mr. Materazzo stated that the items that need to be discussed more in depth at a subsequent meeting are the affordability component, identifying service partners in the community and transportation services. In the unlikely event that the B'nai B'rith building is not constructed, there is an opportunity for a cash payment consideration to the Town. The Town has contracted with a peer reviewer, and she will be available to come before the Board with her findings on the drainage. The DPW raised a list of technical items that have been addressed by the applicant. The Police Safety Officer submitted a memo stating that he is not foreseeing traffic issues based on the submitted traffic analysis. The traffic consultant is available if they Board would like a presentation. The Fire Department had concerns about emergency access that have been addressed.

Mr. Bergeron asked what the peer review focuses on and Mr. Materazzo answered drainage from the site and how it interacts with the existing street system and abutting properties. He added that the peer reviewer would be available to present her findings at a future meeting. Mr. Doherty noted that drainage is his biggest concern.

254 Lowell Street - Strawberry Hill Farm (cont'd):

Ms. Knowles asked why so much parking is provided, as less parking and more green may be better. She asked if parking typically fills up. Mr. Tye stated that parking does fill up and parking numbers are based off of their experience with similar developments. There needs to be spaces available for visitors, and sometimes there are shift overlaps in the staff. A number of residents on the B'nai B'rith side will have a number of drivers and the ratios are typically one parking space per unit. Ms. Knowles felt that the parking for the Bridges building may be excessive. Mr. Chiozzi pointed out that from his experience with these types of facilities the peaks are on Saturdays and Sunday afternoons and there is not enough parking. His suggestion was that they look at areas where they could add pervious pavers on green space for parking when there are no spaces. Mr. Tye stated that from their experience a one to one parking scheme works. Mr. Bergeron asked about holidays when there would be more visitors. Mr. Tye stated on holidays people typically pick up a relative for the day.

Mr. Pouliot stated that the traffic numbers seemed a little light to him. Mr. Tye invited the Board to do a peer review of the traffic analysis and speak with their other facilities in regards to their experience. Mr. Materazzo noted that site visits could be arranged for the Board. Mr. Chiozzi asked if the parking on the B'nai B'rith side would be accessible to those visiting the Bridges residents. Mr. Tye stated that the parking would be independent of one another. Mr. Chiozzi asked if the parking behind the Bridges building would be employee only, and how many staff would be employed. Mr. Tye stated that rear parking would not be restricted, and there would be no more than twelve employees working at once. Mr. Materazzo added that the Zoning Bylaw calls for 64 spaces for a congregate facility. Mr. Chiozzi noted that the Bridges residents would not have cars, but the B'nai B'rith building could have a significant number of resident cars. He asked what the parking requirement would be for a multifamily building. Attorney Johnson stated the parking requirement is one parking space for each one bedroom unit. Mr. Materazzo added that parking for assisted, congregate and independent living have the same ratio.

Ms. Knowles asked about the difference between staffing and nursing and noted that in the memory care building there is no nursing care. Mr. Tye stated that the Bridges is not licensed as a nursing home. They typically provide a wellness coordinator who is a registered nurse.

Mr. Pouliot asked about measures to protect the memory care residents from Lowell Street. Mr. Tye stated that the building would have a security system that would allow residents access to the enclosed interior courtyard, but not the general outside of the building. The residents are not able to access the walking trails outside the courtyards without the staff being made aware.

Ken Russo of 8 Windemere Drive stated that he initially was in favor of this development because of his great experience working in an office park owned by National Development. He also has an elderly father-in-law whom he would love to move to this development, and would ask for the development to include a local preference for the parents of Andover residents. His support for this project changed when he became aware of the annual income limits for affordability some of which are an annual income of less than \$22,000 and the most being less than \$44,000. The Andover Senior Residences will be 100 % affordable so based on income limits his father-in-law would not qualify to live there. He questioned if there could be some allowances made for the affordability as it is discriminatory. Ms. Gittelman stated that financing

254 Lowell Street - Strawberry Hill Farm (cont'd):

for the project does not allow them to change the affordability aspect. Mr. Bergeron asked if the development would meet the affordability requirements if Phase 2 is not constructed. Mr. Tye stated that they would not, which is why they included in their application the suggestion of a cash payment to the Town if it did not happen.

Don Robb of 36 York Street stated that he is the Chairman of the Council of Aging, and the developer will be giving a presentation to the group in September and he will be reporting back to the Board from their point of view. He added that right now there are very few services for seniors on Lowell Street and he questioned what type of transportation services will be provided.

Alan French of 17 Moreland Avenue stated that he has reviewed the application and it fails to meet two of the five criteria of congregate care. The proposed density is far in excess of the existing residential neighborhood and conflicts with the other uses in the area. This development conflicts with the regional smart growth policy and Master Plan because it is far from transportation and downtown facilities. Right now there is an over abundance of market rate senior housing available in the area. The Board needs to make sure that there is a demonstrated need for senior housing, because this application makes no guarantee that the affordable housing will be constructed. The income qualifications do not make this an advantageous development for Andover residents. This will also be a high density development in a gateway to Andover.

Stu McNeil of 37 Sagamore Drive stated that he is a member of the Council on Aging and the Town desperately needs senior housing. He felt that this is a very good site and suggested to raise the age requirement to 65. He added that in regards to affordability, you could fill every one of those units right now with Andover residents who make less than that amount. It would be nice to put it downtown, but there is no land downtown to put something like this.

Mr. Chiozzi questioned why the development would be in two phases. Mr. Tye stated that the timing is dependent on financing. The Bridges can be built tomorrow but the B'nai B'rith financing takes more time as it will have a number of different funding sources. They are not certain but the guess is that Phase 2 will start construction within a year of Phase 1.

Suetta Tenney of 17 Bateson Drive stated that she is a physician in Town and her practice serves residents at these types of facilities. She gave information on the number of memory care facilities within so many miles of Andover which totaled to 33 facilities within 15 miles. She added that one quarter of the non-memory care beds in Marland Place are low income, but none of the memory care units are subsidized. Only 18 of their 40 memory care beds are occupied. At Bright View only half of the memory care beds are filled. The average cost of a memory care unit is \$8,000 a month, \$100,000 a year. The Board would be agreeing to build unaffordable housing where there is no need. She added that congregate housing is defined on the State website as having a common kitchen and a common area, and this does not.

Chet Lyons of 10 Wild Rose Drive stated that he lives in a ranch that does not look like the three storey pitched roof building proposed. He is sympathetic to the affordability aspect, but feels it is out of character for the neighborhood. He added that Andover is a solar community, and asked why there is not a sustainable solar aspect to this development. The neighborhood has had

254 Lowell Street – Strawberry Hill Farm (cont'd):

recent power outages that last 2-5 days. He asked if there is a plan for an emergency generator on site. He questioned if there would be a perimeter fence or a retention pond because he did not see them on the plan. He asked if the drainage will go into the storm sewers and if that means there will be no runoff to 133. He added that he would hate to say yes to Phase 1 and then not have Phase 2 happen.

Mr. Bergeron asked about the height and setbacks of the buildings. Mr. Materazzo stated that the height regulations will be met and the setback is 50 ft from all property lines and 200 ft from residential dwellings. Ms. Duff asked if there will be a perimeter fence around the property and Mr. Tye stated that there would not be a fence around the entire property, only a perimeter fence around the Bridges courtyard.

Andrew Chaban of 21 Regency Ridge stated that his company is a direct abutter to the Bridges development in Westford. He said that he can't speak highly enough about National Development and the good things they do in their communities. He encouraged the Board to visit the Westford facility and see it in the field. He added that he was a former board member at B'nai B'rith and he supports Susan Gittelman's facts on the need for affordable senior housing.

Charlie Erban of 249 Lowell Street stated that he has been a resident for 44 years and has been at his current address for 34 years. He stated that there a huge problems with this type of facility in this location. Any traffic analysis should take into account the close proximity of the IRS, the new medical building coming online and the 150 rental units that are currently under construction on Lowell Street. He added there are 14 acres of land with a driveway behind his house that will eventually be developed. Traffic cannot be looked at in isolation. Right now the site is a 9 acre sponge, after development the water will come across 133 and flood neighboring homes before draining into the wetland. He agreed that electricity issues in the area need to be resolved because the electricity goes out from his house to Route 93.

Heater Lauten of 243 Lowell Street stated that she has the same concerns that her neighbors have already shared and her personal primary concern is the water. The water already sheets down from the Methodist Church driveway and into her home. The storm drains in Lowell Street are insufficient today. The plan shows what she believes is a small retention pond called a rain garden on the site directly across from her property. She is concerned about drainage affecting the structural integrity of her home. She added that she is concerned about her children's safety as the street is already difficult to cross in this active neighborhood of walkers and joggers. Two new sets of entrances/exits will make it even more dangerous for her children to cross the street to get to the bus stop. She asked the Board to also take into consideration that the project will call for a historic structure on the farm to be demolished.

Mr. Bergeron stated that more information is needed on the affordability aspect, traffic, transportation opportunities, design materials, electrical issues and more information on the demographics. Mr. Materazzo stated that for the next meeting they should provide information on the traffic, materials and electrical components. The drainage can be discussed after the peer reviewer comes back with her report.

254 Lowell Street - Strawberry Hill Farm (cont'd):

Steve O'Connell of 6 Robinswood Way asked that the applicant's traffic consultant submit an updated traffic report that reflects planned and permitted development on the 133 corridor. Mr. Bergeron agreed.

On a motion by Ms. Duff seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board moved to continue the public hearing to August 26th at 8:00 p.m. **Vote:** Unanimous (6-0).

It should be noted that after the public hearing on 254 Lowell Street was continued, Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Pouliot left the room at 9:16 p.m. and did not return to the meeting. Ms. Duff chaired the remainder of the meeting.

Merrimack College:

Ms. Duff opened the continued public meeting on an application filed by Merrimack College for a Site Plan Review – Dover Use for Merrimack College for four new dormitories and a community building.

Mr. Materazzo stated that leading up to and at the last meeting residents communicated concerns about the lack of a Master Plan, height of building, noise etc. The Board's review is limited to seven criteria under a Dover use. The Board requested more information on history, parking, traffic as well as floor plans of the dormitories all of which the College has provided.

Felipe Schwarz Assistant Vice President for External Affairs for Merrimack College reviewed the Dover Use topics and how Merrimack is meeting or exceeding all zoning requirements. He went over items that they will be addressed outside of the Dover topics. An enhanced landscape buffer will be provided along Rock Ridge Road. Existing mature trees along Rock Ridge will be kept if possible. Additional flowering trees and shrubs will be added, and the shrubs will be allowed to grow larger than normal. A granite and rail fence is proposed, but they are open to suggestions on fencing along Rock Ridge. The College will add an emergency access gate at the property line with Rock Ridge Road that will be used only by emergency vehicles and as an egress for large events such as graduation. It will no longer be used for deliveries which will eliminate any road trucks from Rock Ridge Road. Mr. Schwarz showed renderings of the landscape buffer with the abutting houses, a map of parking lots on campus and areas reserved for overflow parking. Mr. Materazzo added that Austin Field is currently used as overflow parking. Mr. Schwarz stated that he was correct and if they used all five overflow lots at once it would equal five times as many spaces currently at Austin Field.

Mr. Schwarz stated in regards to traffic they have submitted a traffic analysis based on ITE standards which are conservative. The College requires students to have a parking permit and they have changed the pricing on the parking permits which will reduce the number of students bringing a car to campus. The College will have a new shuttle bus service this fall to carry 25-30 students in and around the area. The campus also has Zip Car and student vans. These measures will decrease the single occupant vehicles being brought to campus. Resident students will park in resident designated lots. The commons building will have staff that work off-peak hours and that is no more than 10-11 staff at its peak.

Mr. Schwarz showed the floor plans of the dormitories and pointed out that there are 3 resident advisor rooms in Buildings 3 and 4, two of which face Rock Ridge Road. There will also be a resident director living in an apartment on campus with 10 resident advisors under him or her.

Mr. Schwarz reviewed the history of the land and pointed out that it does not have any legal restrictions on it, has never been protected open space and has always been anticipated to be used for campus needs. He showed a 2001 plan that called for Austin Field to be a 350 car parking lot, and a 1980s plan to locate a 600 seat auditorium on the land. In the 1950s and 1960s the land was used as an outdoor ice rink. He showed a plan from 1948 of a subdivision of the Andover portion of the land, and then showed the 1947 Master Plan for the College depicting six dormitories on Austin Field.

Ms. Duff noted that for clarification on the floor plans, there are no balconies on the buildings. She asked where the porches face. Mr. Schwarz stated that the porches face both sides of the buildings.

Mr. Materazzo asked the Board if they had any ideas on the fencing. Mr. Doherty stated that he felt that the current fence was not high enough and he prefers a fence that could not be jumped. Mr. Schwarz stated that they could offer more fence options. Mr. Doherty asked if the commons building could be pushed in more in line with the other buildings. Mr. Schwarz stated that they could take a look at that. Mr. Doherty asked if they could push all of the buildings back 10 ft. Mr. Schwarz stated that pushing everything back would affect the pedestrian path and the common green space between buildings. Ms. Knowles offered that they wouldn't lose much if they just pushed the commons building into the open space, and Mr. Schwarz stated that they would take a look at that.

Mr. Doherty asked about the slope that appears on one of their landscaping depictions. There is not currently a slope, so he asked if they will be bringing in fill. Chris Lovett of VHB, the engineer on the project stated that they need to bring in fill in order to raise the site a couple feet to line up with the current Deegan walkway. Ms. Knowles asked how that slope would affect runoff from the walkway to the road. Mr. Lovett stated that the worst scenario is a natural 3 ft drop over 40 ft. Ms. Duff asked how wide the space is between the buildings and Mr. Lovett answered from porch to porch 55 ft. She then asked if there would be safety concerns at 45 ft and Mr. Lovett stated that it would affect the usefulness of the space. Ms. Duff and Ms. Knowles questioned how the space would be used. Mr. Schwarz stated that they see it being used in the same manner as the 2012 dorms, as an area used by students for a variety of things including gathering, studying and exercising etc.

Mr. Doherty asked if the College could send a van to the train station at 1 a.m. so the kids aren't walking through the neighborhoods at that late hour. Mr. Schwarz stated that they are looking into that. Based on demand, they can make changes on the fly to their contracted shuttle service.

Ms. Knowles stated that she wants to see traffic counts for the intersection of Route 114 and Elm Street. Mr. Schwarz stated that he would get the counts and added that they are already working with MassDOT on updating equipment, timing and detection at that intersection.

Mr. Materazzo stated that the College complies with or exceeds zoning regulations and the seven Dover Use criteria. Mr. Doherty noted that the College more than exceeds all criteria and it is disappointing to him that the Planning Board cannot do anything about this project. Tom Urbelis, Town Counsel, added that typically when an applicant comes to the Planning Board for a special permit or a subdivision, the Board has a larger purview and the authority to approve or deny a project. The Legislature has taken that away from the Board with the Dover Amendment. The Dover Amendment applies to the zoning of the project; the College will still have to go before Conservation as appropriate and before the Board of Selectmen as Sewer Commissioners.

Ms. Knowles stated that without any larger plan, change after change is being requested of the neighborhood and although the Board has no say in it, she would like the College to work with the Town more to create comfort around that and make good in an ongoing way. Ms. Duff stated that it would be nice for that to happen but right now the Board can only look at what is in front of them. Ms. Knowles stated that she was just raising it as something that she would really like to see the College do so that each subsequent change could be less abrupt.

Adam Costa, an attorney from Bratman, Brobrowski and Mead, representing the Coalition for Merrimack College Smart Growth stated that he would like the Board to consider three things. The first is he asked the Board to read the cases of Tufts v. City of Medford and Campbell v. City of Lynn which address that an applicant must comply to the extent feasible to the zoning bylaw requirements. He stated that it is the burden of the applicant to prove that those requirements cannot be satisfied in the context of Dover, and he believes the Planning Board has more authority than they think that they do based on these cases. His second point is that he would like the Board to give considerations to what has been requested on setbacks and appropriate buffer and screening to shield the neighbors from nuisance and appropriately condition any decision. Thirdly, he informed the Board that his clients have asked Tom Houston of Professional Services Corporation in Foxboro to perform a review of the project as a second opinion. He had hoped that Mr. Houston would have had something for the Board today, but he does not so he asked that the Board keep the discussion open for him to provide his report.

Matt Wilson of 200 Elm Street stated that the gate on Rock Ridge Road and the rerouting of trucks will now cause the trucks to enter and exit in front of his house. He asked if all trucks could enter and exit from Route 114. He asked how the College plans on enforcing trucks to use the correct entrances or exits. Mr. Schwarz stated that most trucks already use the 114 entrance/exit, and he doesn't have an answer on how it can be enforced. Mr. Materazzo added that construction trucks can be monitored; any other trucks are part of campus operations.

Jennifer Ross of 66 Brookfield Road stated that she is concerned about the floor plan of the commons building and she was expecting to see that floor plan tonight. Mr. Schwarz explained that there will be a student lounge and café on the first floor, fitness center, game space and residential life offices, and a function space on the third floor. Ms. Ross asked about the height of the building, liquor licenses and hours of operation. Mr. Schwarz stated that there are no liquor licenses associated with this project, the height is under 45 ft and the hours are not yet known.

Ms. Knowles asked about the service areas and Mr. Schwarz gave an overview and stated small trucks would make deliveries.

Melissa Marquis of 3 Woodcliff Road asked if porches could not face the neighborhood, as it doesn't make sense to her to have the students face the neighborhood. Mr. Schwarz stated that the buildings are designed so that there has to be entrances on both sides of the building. The buildings are more than 50 ft away from the neighborhood, and noise can be mitigated by security and resident advisor monitoring. Mr. Schwarz added that the Merrimack students are good kids who come in at the age of 18 and are taught how to live in a neighborhood because as soon as they graduate they will be young adults living in neighborhoods of the city or town of their choosing.

Mr. Materazzo asked Mr. Schwarz to remind him of the setback from the closest residence building to Rock Ridge Road. Mr. Schwarz showed the closest building and reiterated that the setback complies with the 40 ft minimum setback which is from the property line not the curb.

Ms. Knowles asked about landscaping maintenance requirements. Mr. Materazzo asked Mr. Schwarz if the College would consider a reasonable condition to be to replace any landscaping that does not last one year. Mr. Schwarz stated that the College has full time groundskeepers and extra attention can be paid to this area.

John Barry of 57 Brookfield Road stated that he appreciated that history perspective, but at the June 12th meeting, a Master Plan with a Phase 3 was referenced and he would like to know more about Phase 3. Mr. Schwarz stated that the College has a Strategic Plan for Growth that was completed in 2010 that deals with initiatives, but they have no Master Plan. One of the goals of that plan is housing 80% of their student population on campus, and they are trying to take significant steps to meet that goal.

Steve McGrath of 66 Brookfield Road stated that the current landscaping in the areas that abut the neighborhood is dire and include dead pine trees. He wanted to know how the neighborhood can have faith that the landscaping will be maintained. Mr. Schwarz stated that he could look into those areas to make sure that the landscaping is maintained.

Bert Ouellette of 30 Fox Hill Road stated that no one in the neighborhood has a concern with the style of the building. He added that the neighbor's objection is not in the loss of the green, but the 350 students who will now be in their front yard. If the College wanted to put four academic buildings on the land there would be no objection. He added that he saw skateboarders today on Rick Ridge Road that went on to the campus and he will have to hear that day in and day out. He will have to continually call the police to get them off of Rock Ridge Road. He wants the College to grow but the 350 kids will have visitors coming from all over who will have cars and cause problems.

Mr. Materazzo recapped what would be looked into for the next meeting. The items are the case law Attorney Costa referenced, fence types and traffic counts on Andover/Elm Street. Mr. Doherty added that he would like the College to look into moving the commons building back

towards the green and Ms. Knowles stated that she wanted more information on the maintenance associated with the landscaping.

Attorney Costa asked for the Board to continue the meeting beyond the 26th so that Mr. Houston could complete his review of the project. Attorney Urbelis stated that in Mr. Houston's letter to the Board he states he will have his review finished in two weeks. Mr. Materazzo added that there are other items that the Board has to address in addition to Mr. Houston's review, so there is no reason to not continue to the Board's next meeting.

Matt Wilson of 200 Elm Street asked for clarification on the parking calculations and if it is based on the number of students and staff and asked what the number is of the total campus population. Mr. Lovett informed him that the parking calculations are based off of a total count of 4,000 people which is more than the maximum occupancy of all students and staff.

On a motion by Ms. Knowles seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board moved to continue the public meeting on Merrimack College to August 26th at 8:30 p.m. **Vote:** Unanimous (4-0).

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:24 p.m.